

PRESIDENT ACCEPTS PARTY NOMINATION

ROOSEVELT'S LETTER TO REPUBLICAN NOTIFICATION COMMITTEE.

PLATFORM MEETS APPROVAL

SAYS IT IS HARD TO FIND THE ISSUES BROUGHT FORTH BY DEMOCRATS.

Reviews the Criticisms of the Opposition and in Turn Criticizes Their Stand on the Various Phases of Public Policy.

The following is a comprehensive synopsis of President Roosevelt's letter of acceptance of the Republican nomination:

"Hon. J. G. Cannon, Chairman of the Notification Committee—My Dear Sir: I accept the nomination for the presidency tendered me by the republican national convention, and cordially approve the platform adopted by it. In writing this letter there are certain points upon which I desire to lay especial stress.

"It is difficult to find out from the utterances of our opponents what are the real issues upon which they propose to wage this campaign. It is not unfair to say that, having abandoned most of the principles upon which they have insisted during the last eight years, they now seem at a loss, both as to what it is that they really believe, and as to how firmly they shall assert their belief in anything. In fact, it is doubtful if they venture resolutely to press a single issue; as such as they raise they shrink from it and seek to explain away. Such an attitude is the probably inevitable result of the effort to importune convictions; for when thus importuned, it is natural that they should be held in a tentative manner.

"The party now in control of the government is troubled by no such difficulties. We do not have to guess at our own convictions, and then correct the guess. It seems unpopular. The principles which we profess are those in which we believe with heart and soul and strength. Men may differ from us; but they cannot accuse us of selfishness or insincerity. The policies we have pursued are those which we earnestly hold as essential to the national welfare and repute. Our actions speak even louder than our words for the faith that is in us. We have our appeal upon what we have done and are doing; upon our record of administration and legislation during the last seven years, in which we have had complete control of the government. We intend in the future to carry on the government in the same way that we have carried it on in the past.

A Disrupted Party.
"A party whose members are radically at variance on most vital issues, and if united at all, are only united on issues where their attitude threatens widespread disaster to the whole country, cannot be trusted to govern in any matter. A party which with facile ease changes all its convictions before election cannot be trusted to adhere with tenacity to any principle after election. A party fit to govern must have convictions. In 1892 the republican party came into power, and in 1897 retained power on certain definite pledges, each of which was scrupulously fulfilled. But in addition to meeting and solving the problems which were issues in those campaigns, it also became necessary to meet other problems which arose after election; and it is no small part of our claim to public confidence that these were solved with the same success that had attended the solution of those concerning which the battles at the polls were fought. In other words, our governmental efficiency proved equal not only to the tasks that were anticipated, but to doing each unanticipated task as it arose.

"When the contest of 1896 was decided, the question of the war with Spain was not an issue. When the contest of 1898 was decided, the shape which the isthmian canal question ultimately took could not have been foreseen. But the same qualities which enabled those responsible for making and administering the laws at Washington to deal successfully with the tariff and the currency, enabled them also to deal with the Spanish war, and the same qualities which enabled them to act wisely in the Philippines, and in Cuba also enabled them to do their duty as regards the problems connected with the trusts, and to secure the building of the isthmian canal. We are content to rest our case before the American people upon the fact that to adherence to a lofty ideal we have added proved governmental efficiency. Therefore, our promises may surely be trusted as regards any issue that is now before the people; and we may equally be trusted to deal with any problem which may hereafter arise.

"So well has the work been done that our opponents do not venture to recite the facts about our policies or acts, and then oppose them. They attack them only when they have first misrepresented them; for a truthful recital would leave no room for adverse comment.

The action of the administration in connection with the Panama revolution and the signing of the canal treaty is outlined and the president says:

"Criticism of the action in this matter is simply criticism of the only possible action which could have secured the building of the canal; as well as the peace and quiet which we were, by treaty, bound to preserve along the line of transit across the isthmus. The service rendered this country in securing the

perpetual right to construct, maintain, operate, and defend the canal was so great that our opponents do not venture to raise the issue in straightforward fashion; for if so raised there would be no issue."

Democratic Misrepresentation.
He charges misrepresentation on the part of the democrats in the statements of the conduct of the foreign policy of the administration and the operations of the navy, and asks:

"Do our opponents object to the way in which the Monroe doctrine has been strengthened and upheld? Never before has this doctrine been acquiesced in abroad as it is now; and yet, while upholding the rights of the weaker American republics against foreign aggression, the administration has lost no opportunity to point out to these republics that those who seek equity should come with clean hands, and that whoever claims liberty as a right must accept the responsibilities that go with the exercise of the right. Do our opponents object to what was done in reference to the petition of American citizens against the Kishinev massacre? or to the protest against the treatment of the Jews in Roumania? or to the efforts that have been made in behalf of the Armenians in Turkey? No other administration in our history, no other government in the world, has more consistently stood for the broadest spirit of brotherhood, in our common humanity, or has held a more resolute attitude of protest against every wrong that outraged the civilization of the age, at home or abroad. Do our opponents object to the fact that the international tribunal at the Hague was rescued from impotence, and turned into a potent instrument for peace among the nations? This government has need that tribunal, and advocated its use by others, in pursuance of its policy to promote the cause of international peace and good will by all honorable methods. In carrying out this policy, it has settled disputes after dispute by arbitration or by friendly agreement. It has behaved towards all nations strong or weak, with courtesy, dignity and justice; and it is now on excellent terms with all.

"Do our opponents object to the settlement of the Alaska boundary line? Do they object to the fact that after freeing Cuba we gave her reciprocal trade advantages with the United States, while at the same time keeping naval stations in the island and providing against its sliding into chaos, or being conquered by any foreign power? Do they object to the fact that our flag now flies over Porto Rico? Do they object to the acquisition of Hawaii? Once they "haunted" our flag there; we have hoisted it again; do they intend once more to haul it down? Do they object to the part we played in China? Do they not know that the voice of the United States would now count for nothing in the far east if we had abandoned the Philippines and refused to do what was done in China? Do they object to the fact that this government secured a peaceful settlement of the troubles in Venezuela two years ago? Do they object to the presence of the ship-of-war off Colon when the revolution broke out in Panama, and when only the presence of this ship saved the lives of American citizens and prevented insult to the flag? Do they object to the fact that American warships appeared promptly at the port of Beirut when an effort had been made to assassinate an American official, and in the port of Tangier when an American citizen had been abducted? and that in each case the wrong complained of was righted and expiated? and that within the last few days the visit of an American squadron to Smyrna was followed by the long-delayed concession of their just rights to those Americans concerned in educational work in Turkey? Do they object to the trade treaty with China, so full of advantage for the American people in the future? Do they object to the fact that the ship carrying the national flag now have a higher standard than ever before in marinership and in seamanship, as individual units and as component parts of squadrons and fleets? If they object to any or all of these things, we join issue with them.

"Executive Encroachments."
"When our opponents speak of 'encroachments' by the executive upon the authority of congress or the judiciary, apparently the act they ordinarily have in view is Pension Order No. 78, issued under the authority of existing law. This order directed that hereafter any veteran of the civil war who had reached the age of 62 should be presumptively entitled to the pension of six dollars a month, given under the dependent pension law to those whose capacity to earn their livelihood by manual labor has been decreased 50 per cent, and that by the time the age of 70 was reached the presumption should be that the physical disability was complete; the age being treated as an evidential fact in each case. This order was made in the performance of a duty imposed upon the president by an act of congress, which requires the executive to make regulations to govern the subordinates of the pension office in determining who are entitled to pensions. President Cleveland had already exercised this power by a regulation which declared that 75 should be set as the age at which total disability should be conclusively presumed. Similarly President McKinley established 65 as the age at which half disability should be conclusively presumed. The regulation now in question, in the exercise of the same power, supplemented these regulations made under Presidents Cleveland and McKinley.

"If our opponents come into power they can revoke this order and announce that they will treat the veterans of 62 to 70 as presumably in full bodily vigor and not entitled to pensions. Will they now authoritatively state that they intend to do this? If so, we accept the issue. If not, then we have the right to ask why they raise an issue which, when raised, they do not venture to meet."

Criticism of the administration's settlement of the coal strike and the suit against the Northern Securities company are cited, and the president says:

"Such mutually destructive criticisms furnish an adequate measure of the chances for coherent action or constructive legislation if our opponents should be given power."

Democratic Policies.
Of the policies for which the democratic party profess to stand the president says:

"So much for what our opponents openly or covertly advance in the way of an attack on the acts of the administration. When we come to consider the policies for which they profess to stand we are met with the difficulty always arising when statements of policy are so made that they can be interpreted in different ways. On some of the vital questions that have confronted the American people in the last decade our opponents take the position that silence is the best possible way to convey their views. They contend that their lukewarm attitude of partial acquiescence in what others have accomplished entitles them to be made the custodians of the financial honor and commercial interests which they have but recently sought to ruin."

He reviews the history of the republican party's efforts to establish a stable national currency, and says:

"Until our opponents as a party explicitly adopt the views which we hold and upon which we have acted and are acting, in the matter of a sound currency, the only real way to keep the question from becoming unsettled is to keep the republican party in power."

"The record of the last seven years proves that the party now in power can be trusted to take the additional action necessary to improve and strengthen our monetary system, and that our opponents cannot be so trusted. The fundamental fact is that in a popular government such as ours no policy is irrevocably settled by law unless the people keep in control of the government men who believe in that policy as a matter of deep-rooted conviction. Laws can always be revoked; it is the spirit and the purpose of those responsible for their enactment and administration which must be fixed and unchangeable. It is idle to say that the monetary standard of the nation is irrevocably fixed so long as the party which at the last election cast approximately 46 per cent. of the total vote, refuses to put in its platform any statement that the question is settled. A determination to remain silent cannot be accepted as equivalent to a recantation."

He points to the record of the administration in its dealings with both capital and labor, and carefully outlines each step that has been taken for the enforcement of the anti-trust laws, and explains the need of such laws on the national statute books in opposition to the democratic claim "that the common law, as developed, affords a complete legal remedy against monopolies," and of this he says:

"But there is no common law of the United States. Its rules can be enforced only by the state courts and officers. No federal court or officer could take any action whatever under them. It was this fact, coupled with the inability of the States to control trusts and monopolies, which led to the passage of the federal statutes known as the Sherman anti-trust act and the interstate commerce act; and it is only through the exercise of the powers conferred by these acts, and by the statutes of the last congress supplementing them, that the national government can require any jurisdiction over the subject. To say that action against trusts and monopolies should be limited to the application of the common law is equivalent to saying that the national government should take no action whatever to regulate them."

Responsible for Trusts' Increase.

Continuing on the subject of trusts the president says:

"Undoubtedly, the multiplication of trusts and their increase in power has been largely due to the failure of officials charged with the duty of enforcing the law to take the necessary procedure. Such stricture upon the failure of the officials of the national government to do their duty in this matter is certainly not wholly undeserved as far as the administration preceding President McKinley is concerned; but it has no application at all to republican administration. It is also undoubtedly true that what is most needed is 'officials having both the disposition and the courage to enforce existing law.' This is precisely the need that has been met by the consistent and steadily continued action of the department of justice under the present administration."

"So far as the rights of the individual wage-worker and the individual capitalist are concerned, both as regards one another, as regards organized capital and labor, the position of the administration has been so clear that there is no excuse for misrepresentation; and no ground for opposing it unless misrepresented. Within the limits defined by the national constitution the national administration has sought to secure to each man the full enjoyment of his right to live his life and dispose of his property and his labor as he deems best, so long as he wrongs no one else. It has shown in effective fashion that in endeavoring to make good this guarantee, it treats all men, rich or poor, whatever their creed, their color, or their birthplace as standing alike before the law. Under our form of government the sphere in which the nation as distinguished from the state can act is narrowly circumscribed; but within that sphere all that could be done has been done. All thinking men are aware of the restriction upon the power of action of the national government in such matters. Being ourselves mindful of them, we have been scrupulously careful on the one hand to be moderate in our promises, and on the other hand to keep these promises in letter and in spirit. Our opponents have been hampered by no such considerations. They have promised, and many of them now promise

action which they could by no possibility take in the exercise of constitutional power, and which, if attempted, would bring business to a standstill; they have used, and often now use, language of wild invective and appeal to all the baser passions which tend to excite one set of Americans against their fellow-Americans; and yet whenever they have had power they have fittingly supplemented this extravagance of promise by absolute nullity in performance."

Referring to the demand in the democratic platform that negotiations be begun with foreign governments to secure equal treatment of all Americans from those governments which do not now accord it, the president says:

"This government is based upon the fundamental idea that each man, no matter what his occupation, his race, or his religious belief, is entitled to be treated on his worth as a man, and neither favored nor discriminated against because of any accident in his position. Even here at home there is painful difficulty in the effort to realize this ideal; and the attempt to secure from other nations acknowledgment of it sometimes encounters obstacles that are well-nigh insuperable, for there are many nations which in the slow procession of the ages have not yet reached that point where the principles which Americans regard as axiomatic obtain any recognition whatever. One of the chief difficulties arises in connection with certain American citizens of foreign birth, or of particular creed, who desire to travel abroad. Russia, for instance, refuses to admit and protect Jews. Turkey refuses to admit and protect certain sects of Christians. This government has consistently demanded equal protection abroad for all 'merican citizens, whether native or naturalized. On March 27, 1899, Secretary Hay sent a letter of instructions to all the diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, in which he said: 'This department does not discriminate between native-born and naturalized citizens in according them protection while they are abroad, equality of treatment being required by the laws of the United States.' These orders to our agents abroad have been repeated again and again, and are treated as the fundamental rule of conduct laid down for them, proceeding upon the theory that all naturalized citizens of the United States while in foreign countries are entitled to and shall receive from this government the same protection of persons and property which is accorded to native-born citizens.' In issuing passports the state department never discriminates, or alludes to any man's religion; and in granting to every American citizen, native or naturalized, Christian or Jew, the same passport, so far as it has power it insists that all foreign governments shall accept the passport as prima facie proof that the person therein described is a citizen of the United States and entitled to protection as such. It is a standing order to every American diplomatic and consular officer to protect every American citizen, of whatever faith, from unjust molestation; and our officers abroad have been strictly required to comply with this order."

Under such circumstances, the demand of our opponents that negotiations be begun to secure equal treatment of all Americans from those governments which do not now accord it, shows either ignorance of the facts or insincerity. No change of policy in the method or manner of negotiation would add effectiveness to what the state department has done and is doing."

Of the enforcement and extension of the civil service law the president says:

"Our opponents have now declared themselves in favor of the civil service law, the repeal of which they demanded in 1901 and in 1895. If consistent, they should have gone one step further and congratulated the country upon the way in which the civil service law is now administered, and the way in which the classified service has been extended. The exceptions from examinations are fewer by far than ever before, and are confined to individual cases, where the application of the rules would be impracticable, unwise, unjust, or unnecessary. The administration of the great body of the classified civil service is free from politics, and appointments and removals have been put upon a business basis. Statistics show that there is little difference between the tenure of the federal classified employees and that of the employees of private business corporations. Less than one per cent. of the classified employees are over 70 years of age, and in the main the service rendered is vigorous and efficient. Where the merit system was of course most needed was in the Philippine islands; and a civil service law of very advanced type has there been put into operation and scrupulously observed. Without one exception every appointment in the Philippines has been made in accordance with the strictest standard of fitness, and without heed to any other consideration."

The Real Issues.
In passing from the democratic criticisms of the administration to what are called the real issues of the campaign, he says:

"Finally we come to certain matters upon which our opponents do in their platform of principles definitely take issue with us, and where, if they are sincere, their triumph would mean disaster to the country. But exactly as it is impossible to call attention to the present promises and past record of our opponents without seeming offensive, so it is impossible to compare their platform with their other and later official utterances and not create doubt as to their sincerity. In their private or unofficial utterances many of them frankly advance this insincerity as a merit, taking the position that as regards the points on which I am about to speak they have no intention of keeping their promises or of departing from the policies now established, and that therefore

they can be trusted not to abuse the power they seek."

The Tariff Issue.
He charges the democrats with insincerity and evasiveness in their statements regarding a tariff policy, and says:

"Undoubtedly it would be possible at the present time to prevent any of the trusts from remaining prosperous by the simple expedient of making such a sweeping change in the tariff as to paralyze the industries of the country. The trusts would cease to prosper; but their smaller competitors would be ruined, and the wage-workers would starve, while it would not pay the farmer to haul his produce to market."

Continuing on the subject of the tariff he says:

"From time to time schedules must undoubtedly be rearranged and readjusted to meet the shifting needs of the country; but this can with safety be done only by those who are committed to the cause of the protective system. To uproot and destroy that system would be to insure the prostration of business, the closing of factories, the impoverishment of the farmer, the ruin of the capitalist, and the starvation of the wage-worker."

"It is a matter of regret that the protective tariff policy, which, during the last 40 odd years, has become part of the very fiber of the country, is not now accepted as definitely established. Surely we have a right to say that it has passed beyond the domain of theory, and a right to expect that not only its original advocates but those who at one time distrusted it on theoretic grounds, should now acquiesce in the results that have been proved over and over again by actual experience. These 40 odd years have been the most prosperous years this nation has ever seen; more prosperous years than any other nation has ever seen. Beyond question this prosperity could not have come if the American people had not possessed the necessary thrift, energy and business intelligence to turn their vast material resources to account. But it is no less true that it is our economic policy as regards the tariff and finance which has enabled us as a nation to make such good use of the individual capacities of our citizens, and the natural resources of our country. Every class of our people is benefited by the protective tariff. During the last few years the merchant has seen the export trade of this country grow faster than ever in our previous history. The manufacturer could not keep his factory running if it were not for the protective tariff. The wage-worker would do well to remember that if protection is 'robbery,' he will be the first to pay the penalty; for either he will be turned adrift entirely, or his wages will be cut down to the starvation point. As conclusively shown by the bulletins of the bureau of labor, the purchasing power of the average wage received by the wage-worker has grown faster than the cost of living, and this in spite of the continual shortening of working hours. The accumulated savings of the workmen of the country, as shown by the deposits in the savings banks, have increased by leaps and bounds. At no time in the history of this or any other country has there been an era so productive of material benefit alike to workman and employer as during the seven years that have just passed."

"The farmer has benefited quite as much as the manufacturer, the merchant, and the wage-worker. The most welcome and impressive fact established by the last census is the wide and even distribution of wealth among all classes of our countrymen. The chief agencies in producing this distribution are shown by the census to be the development of manufactures, and the application of new inventions to universal use. The result has been an increasing interdependence of agriculture and manufactures."

Republican Reciprocity.
On the subject of reciprocity the president says:

"Our opponents assert that they believe in reciprocity. Their action on the most important reciprocity treaty recently negotiated—that with Cuba—does not bear out this assertion. Moreover, there can be no reciprocity unless there is a substantial tariff; free trade and reciprocity are not compatible. We are on record as favoring arrangements for reciprocal trade relations with other countries, these arrangements to be on an equitable basis of benefit to both the contracting parties. The republican party stands pledged to every wise and consistent method of increasing the foreign commerce of the country. That it has kept its pledge is proven by the fact that while the domestic trade of this country exceeds in volume the entire export and import trade of all the nations of the world, the United States has in addition secured more than an eighth of the export trade of the world, standing first among the nations in this respect."

Of the proposition to reduce the size of the army the president says:

"If our opponents should come into power they could not reduce our army below its present size without greatly impairing its efficiency and abandoning part of its national duty. In short, in this matter, if our opponents should come into power they would either have to treat this particular promise of the year 1904 as they now treat the promises they made in 1896 and 1900, that is, as possessing no binding force; or else they would have to embark on a policy which would be ludicrous at the moment, and fraught with grave danger to the national honor in the future."

He reviews the administration of the government finances and refutes the charge that the government is administered extravagantly with facts and figures, and says:

"Do our opponents grudge the \$50,000,000 paid for the Panama canal? Do they intend to cut down on the pensions to the veterans of the civil war? Do they intend to put a stop to the irrigation policy? or to the permanent census bureau? or to immigration inspection?

Do they intend to abolish rural free delivery? Do they intend to cut down the navy? or the Alaskan telegraph system? Do they intend to dismantle our coast fortifications? If there is to be a real and substantial cutting down in national expenditures it must be in such matters as these. The department of agriculture has done service of incalculable value to the farmers of this country in many different lines. Do our opponents wish to cut down the money for this service? They can do it only by destroying the usefulness of the service itself."

Philippine Independence.

He refers to the promise in the democratic platform to give independence to the Philippine islands and after speaking of the folly of such a promise, says:

"It may well be that our opponents have no real intention of putting their promise into effect. If this is the case, if, in other words, they are insincere in the promise they make, it is only necessary to say again that it is unwise to trust men who are false in one thing to deal with anything. The mere consciousness of broken faith would hamper them in continuing our policy in the islands; and only by continuing unchanged this policy can the honor of the country be maintained, or the interests of the islands subserved. If on the other hand, our opponents came into power and attempted to carry out their promises to the Philippines by giving them independence, and withdrawing American control from the islands, the result would be a frightful calamity to the Philippines themselves, and in its larger aspect would amount to an international crime. Anarchy would follow; and the most violent anarchy forces would be directed partly against the civil government, partly against all forms of religious and educational civilization. Bloody conflicts would inevitably ensue in the archipelago, and just as inevitably the islands would become the prey of the first power which in its own selfish interest took up the task we had bravely abandoned."

"During the last five years more has been done for the material and moral well-being of the Philippines than ever before since the islands first came within the ken of civilized man. We have opened before them a vista of orderly development in their own interest and not a policy of exploitation. Every effort is being made to fit the islands for self-government, and they have already in large measure received it, while for the first time in their history their personal rights and civil liberties have been guaranteed. They are being educated; they have been given schools; they have been given libraries; roads are being built for their use; their health is being cared for; they have been given courts in which they receive justice as absolute as it is in our power to guarantee. Their individual rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are now by act of congress jealously safeguarded under the American flag; and if the protection of the flag were withdrawn their rights would be lost, and the islands would be plunged back under some form of vicious tyranny. We have given them more self-government than they have ever before had; we are taking steps to increase it still further by providing them with an elected legislative assembly; and surely we had better await the result of this experiment—for it is a wholly new experiment in Asia—before we make promises which as a nation we might be forced to break, or which they might interpret any way and we in another. It may be asserted without fear of successful contradiction that nowhere else in recent years has there been as fine an example of constructive statesmanship and wise and upright administration as has been given by the civil authorities, aided by the army, in the Philippine islands. We have administered them in the interest of their own people; and the Philippines themselves have profited most by our presence in the islands; but they have also been of very great advantage to us as a nation."

Conclusion.

In conclusion the president says:

"Our appeal is made to all good citizens who hold the honor and the interest of the nation close to their hearts. The great issues which are at stake, and upon which I have touched, are more than mere partisan issues, for they involve much that comes home to the individual pride and individual well-being of our people. Under conditions as they actually are, good Americans should refuse, for the sake of the welfare of the nation, to change the national policy. We, who are responsible for the administration and legislation under which this country, during the last seven years, has grown so greatly in well-being at home and in honorable repute among the nations of the earth abroad, do not stand inertly upon this record, do not use this record as an excuse for failure of effort to meet new conditions. On the contrary, we treat the record of what we have done in the past as incentive to do even better in the future. We believe that the progress that we have made may be taken as a measure of the progress we shall continue to make if the people again entrust the government of the nation to our hands. We do not stand still. We press steadily forward toward the goal of moral and material well-being for our own people, or just and fearless dealing toward all other peoples, in the interest not merely of this country, but of mankind. There is not a policy, foreign or domestic, which we are now carrying out, which it would not be disastrous to reverse or abandon. If our opponents should come in and should not reverse our policies, then they would be branded with the brand of broken faith, of false promise, of insincerity in word and deed; and no man can work to the advantage of the nation with such a brand clinging to him. If, on the other hand they should come in and reverse any or all of our policies, by just so much would the nation as a whole be damaged. Alike as lawmakers and as administrators of the law we have endeavored to do our duty in the interest of the people as a whole."

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT."